"The Secretary of this State" [*J. Alex. Dallas*, Secretary of Pennsylvania] "possessed great influence "in the popular Society of Philadelphia, which, in its turn, influenced those of other states; of course "he merited attention. It appears, therefore, that these men, with others unknown to me, all having, "without doubt, Randolph [the Secretary of State] at their head, were balancing to decide on the part "they should take. Two or three days before the proclamation" [proclamation against the insurgents] "was "published, and of course before the cabinet had resolved on its measures, Mr. Randolph came to see "me with an air of great eagerness, and made to me the overtures, of which I have given you an ac- "count in my No. 6. Thus, with *some thousands of dollars*, the French republic could have decided on "civil war, or on peace! Thus, the *consciences* of the *pretended patriots of America* have *already their* "*prices!* It is very true that the certainty of these conclusions, painful to be drawn, will for ever exist "in our archives! What will be the old age of this government, if it is thus early decrepid?"——*Dis- patch of the French Envoy*, FAUCHET, *to the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, written from Philadel- phia, in* 1794.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL.——I return once more to this subject for the purpose of answering my correspondent, whose letter will be found immediately below, and who seems very angry at what has been said, in the Register, respecting the American States.—— In giving my readers a description of the nature and tendency of the Orders in Council, I stated, in page 336 of this volume, that the late ministers had declared to the neutral powers, that if they submitted to the audacious principle openly proclaimed by France, that England would retaliate, and would have an undoubted right so to do. I added: "the neutrals do submit, for neither "of them make any public remonstrance, "or protest, against the decrees of France." This assertion my correspondent says I make "in the face of the notorious fact, of the "immediate explanation of the French de- "cree, given by the French minister of ma- "rine, Dacrès, to the American envoy at "Paris." That I had no wish to disguise the fact of this explanation is evident, because I mentioned it, in the article referred to, and in the very next page to that whence my correspondent has extracted what he is pleased to regard as a false assertion.——It is true, that the American envoy did address a note to the French minister of marine, representing to him, that the decree, if acted upon, with regard to America, would be a violation of the treaty existing between her and France; but, was this a "*public remonstrance*, or *protest*, against the decree?" It was a claim of exemption from the effects of its operation, merely upon the ground of a particular previous compact, and not upon that of the decree being founded upon a tyrannical principle, and being a thing to be opposed on grounds independent of all particular convention. And what was the answer of Dacrès? What was the famous explanation, which satisfied the American President, and which, it was wished, should satisfy us? Why, the answer was, *that the decree would produce no violation of the treaty between France and America*; leaving it quite undecided whether the decree would be *enforced*, or not. The decree remained unrepealed; it contained no exceptions; and, if it was not executed, with regard to America, this exception in the execution was, undoubtedly, owing to a conviction, that to execute it would be injurious to France. The principle, however, remained the same; the *insult* to England the same; and the acquiescence of America the same; as far as related to England, the relaxation of France has been obtained for the mutual benefit of France and America only. America was a neutral power; but not the only one. She had no right to sacrifice the interests of the other neutrals to her own selfish purposes. She made no remonstrance, that has ever come to light, against the *principle* of the French decree; she submitted to the principle; she tacitly acknowledged, that France had a right to declare England in a state of blockade, and to place her under an interdict, and merely pleaded for an exemption, as far as she was concerned, upon the ground of her treaty with France. The French minister gave a vague answer; and, it is well worthy of remark, that even this answer never was made public, until the Orders in Council began to make their appearance. The fact obviously enough appears to have been this: the decree, the conqueror's decree, issued from Berlin, was intended for general and indiscriminate operation; but, the Americans having succeeded in convincing France, that such operation

would be finally more injurious to France than to England, France relented as to the execution of the decree; and the letter of Dacrès is to be regarded as a thing contrived between him and the American envoy. But, the letter of the decree remained; the insult remained entire; and the execution took place, wherever it was thought to work more injury to England than to France. Thus France was to issue a general prohibitory decree against the commerce between England and neutral states, which, no one can deny, gave England a right to retaliate by a measure also general; but, France finding that there was one neutral, whom it would be to her interest to exempt from the execution of the decree, she grants such an exemption, and, thereupon that neutral comes and says, "France exempts me, and "so must you." "No," say we, "the "decree is general, and general must be the "retaliation. It is the interest of France to "make an exception in your favour; but "such is not the interest of England. There "is no way for you to avoid the effects of "our retaliation, other than that of prevailing upon France to repeal her general decree, against the *principle* of which you "have made no complaint, that we hear of, "even in private. You have tacitly approved of that principle; and, as France "has been the sole judge of the exceptions "for herself to make, you must allow us to "exercise a similar judgment." Could any thing be more just, or reasonable?——My correspondent says, that my assertion, relating to the *submission* of America was made also "in the face of the notorious fact, that, "down to the date of our Orders in Council, no American vessel has been condemned, and only two captured," in virtue of the French decree. If this fact be true, the statements of Sir William Scott are false, which I do not believe; and I well know, that a ship of ours, which re-captured an American vessel, taken under the Berlin decree, obtained *salvage* in our court of Admiralty, which might, indeed, be one cause of Dacrès's explanation. Besides, Lord Howick, long ago, informed our minister in America, that "His Majesty had learnt, "that, in some instances, the decree had "been carried into execution." But, I expressly said, in the article, of which this American complains, that "it was of no "consequence, whether there had, or had "not, been any instance, wherein the decree had been carried into execution." The decree existed, and, if no captures took place, in consequence of it, the cause was, not any *resistance*, on the part of America, but the inability of France to execute the decree, in that way. In other respects, however, she had the power to execute, and, if we are to retaliate, we are not to make the exceptions that suit her; that is to say, to forbear to retaliate there only, where she has not the power of execution, and where only we have that power. Lord Howick calls upon America to *resist* the pretensions of France, and declares the king's undoubted right of retaliation, unless such resistance take place. No resistance takes place; a submission to the principle of the decree does takes place; and an attempt is made to evade our retaliation by an underhand correspondence between the American envoy and the French minister of marine, kept a profound secret, as far as I have observed, until our Orders in Council began to make their appearance.——This American tells us, that to refuse to pay implicit credit to the explanation of Dacrès is "to pretend to "know better than the Doctor; for, one "would naturally suppose, that the opinion "of a French minister, on a French decree "(and still more the uninterrupted course of "acting thereupon) was of more authority "than the opinion of an English lawyer." So, because it is I who write a letter, saying that I have seen a black horse to-day, another man is to believe, that my words mean, that I have not seen a black horse to-day, merely because I find it convenient to say, that my words have no such meaning. According to this, no written instrument of any sort could possibly carry any fixed and determinate sense. The decree prohibits *all* trade between England and neutral states; it prohibits *all* communication between them; it lays England under a commercial interdict; it makes no exceptions; it neither calls for nor admits of explanation. But, because America and France find it to be their interest to make an explanation as to the execution of it, we are to admit of that explanation, upon the principle, that those who have issued the decree must best understand its meaning. When the poor fellow, who went to America in search of liberty, was going to the jail where he expired for having written what was called a libel upon Mr. Jefferson, he found, alas! that his meaning was left to the opinion of others, and that he was not himself to be the interpreter of it. ——As to the "uninterrupted course of "acting upon this French minister's opi-"nion," that has been before accounted for. It is to be observed, however, that this American lays no weight upon the circumstance, that *other parts* of the decree were rigorously executed; such parts as Napoleon could

cause to be executed without injury to himself. A defender of Mr. Jefferson says: it was not for America to commence knight errant, and contend with France for the interests of other neutrals. That was not *expected* of her, it is true; but, if she chose not to do it; if she chose to acquiesce in the principle of the decree, upon the condition that she should be exempted from its injurious effects, that could be no reason for our exempting her in the execution of any measure of retaliation, which we might think it right to adopt. France exempted her upon the ground of self-interest; no such motive could we perceive for an exemption. On the contrary, we found her as hostile towards us as her means of hostility would allow her to be. We found her with a non-importation act, passed in order to *punish* us for not giving up to her a right, the exercise of which was essential to the preservation of, not our naval superiority, but of our navy itself. If America will so act as to make it our interest to exempt her from the effect of our maritime regulations, we shall then, doubtless, be ready to exempt her, as France did; but, until then, I hope we shall not.—No: it was not feelings of "contempt," that the "empty blockade" was calculated to inspire. It was feelings of indignation, and of just vengeance, not only against France, but against every power, who, either by direct or indirect means, gave their sanction to the abominably insolent principle of the Berlin decree. It was not the loss of commerce, but the loss of character, which we should have sustained, by leaving that sanction unpunished. We were called upon by every motive, which, under such circumstances, ought to animate a nation, to convince the world, that every state, who dared to insult us, would rue the effects of its conduct.——What resemblance is there, I would ask, between the Berlin decree and the wearing of the title and arms of the kingdom of France, by the king of England? A title that had been won by our ancestors, who *really* conquered and who *really* governed France, and which title was as much our property as the name of any man is his property. All the world knew, that it aimed no insult against France; that it was a mere record, or memorial, of deeds long passed. Can the same be said of a decree, which was professedly intended to cut England off from all connection with the rest of the world, until the day, when she would submit her neck to the yoke of France. This American, under the influence of that unnatural and base partiality, pervading the minds of so many of his countrymen, thinks it was a "*galling* yoke" that the French submitted to in permitting us to wear the arms and regal title of France; but, he seems to think very little of the yoke, which Napoleon has pledged himself to make us wear, and, as a preparatory step to which, he was endeavouring to place us under an interdict.—— This correspondent charges me with "a gross mistatement of a plain matter of fact;" and then he states, with truth, perhaps, that what I said, in page 337, respecting a rise in the rate of insurance, which would naturally be occasioned by the Berlin decree, was incorrect. My statement related not to "a plain matter of fact." It related to what would, in my opinion, naturally be the case; it was calculated upon "the danger of capture in consequence of the French decree;" but, if the secret understanding between France and America was made known in America, then there would, of course, be no such consequence. This gentleman has, however, *blinked* the matter; for, though what he has said may be true, with regard to ships and cargoes coming from America, can he prove that it was so with respect to ships and cargoes going from England to America? If he can show, that the decree had no effect upon the rate of insurance as to such property, I shall think that the merchants concerned had a contempt for the power of France; but, I shall not, even in that case, think that we ought to have exempted America from the effects of our commercial regulations, seeing that she had *not resisted* the principle of the French decree, but had tacitly acquiesced in the right of France, generally speaking, to declare England to be in a state of blockade.—— The conclusion of the letter of this "American Merchant" contains the following assertion: "You conceive yourself to have "been personally ill-treated in the United "States, and, it is *currently reported*, that "you said to a fellow-passenger with you "to England, that you hated the United "States, and that, if ever an opportu-"nity occurred to blow up the flame "of discord between the two countries, "you would make the most of it."——That I was most unjustly and basely treated in the American States, and by two of the governments of that country, is a fact pretty well known to every person, who reads or hears much about America; that (with the exception of the Quakers of Pennsylvania, many other individuals in that State, and the people of New England) I hate the United States and all their mean and hypocritical system of rule, I have a thousand times declared in print as well as in conversation, and I have

further frequently declared, that, if I, or any one most dear to me, were destined to lose my or his life in a *just* war, I knew of no case, in which that life would be lost with so little regret, on my part, as in demolishing the towns of America and in burying their unprincipled inhabitants under the rubbish. But, that I ever said, that I would avail myself of an "opportunity to blow up "the flame of discord between the two "countries," is a falshood; and, if the author of this charge had been any thing, no matter what, but an American, by birth or adoption, he would not, particularly after the invitation contained in my last Register, have been so mean, so detestably cowardly, as to have suffered this charge to come forth unsupported by *a name.*——Those who have thought it worth their while constantly to read this publication, can scarcely fail to remember what, I think, must convince them of the falshood of this pretended report. Many are the occasions, upon which I have thought it right to point out what I thought likely to secure the good will of America; and especially have I recommended the sending of persons of high rank as well as character, in the quality of ministers thither. At the making of the peace of Amiens I deprecated the idea of "placing the French upon the back of the Americans;" and I have uniformly recommended such a line of conduct towards America as would be likely to prevent a war between the two countries; though, from the bottom of my soul, I believe, that such war would, now at least, be greatly beneficial to England.—— But, of what consequence are my feelings, my love or my hatred, my forgiveness or my revenge, in this discussion? I have asked no man to rely upon my *opinions* of America. I have said, this hath she said and this hath she done. Let my statements be contradicted, and proved to be false; or, let the facts themselves be shown to weigh nothing against her character; but, let no one hope to defend her by alledging that *her accuser is prejudiced.* He who has been robbed and assaulted has certainly no prejudice in favour of the robber, but is as certainly prejudiced against him; yet, we never hear this prejudice urged against the credibility of his testimony. Who is to complain but those who have suffered? Who is to accuse, if those are to be silent who have been witnesses of the guilt?——But, after all, supposing me to have said, that I would avail myself of any opportunity that should offer to blow up the flame of war between the two countries, this may account for the asperity of my language (and I have no desire that my language with respect to America should appear in any other light), but it can, in nowise, affect the state of the case, upon which the two nations are in dispute. It was not I who spurred on Mr. Jefferson to demand of England a renunciation of the right of searching for seamen. It was not I who inspired America with the insolent notion of forcing England to renounce this right, and to employ for the purpose an act of non-importation, passed just as a negociation was set on foot, and kept suspended while it was going on. It was not I who counselled Mr. Jefferson to send back to the king of England a treaty, concluded and duly signed by the plenipotentiaries on both sides, and to chalk out the alterations to be made, exactly in the same way, in which articles of capitulation are returned by a besieging general. It was not I who puffed this republican sovereign up with the conceit that he was able to bully the king of England into a revival of the negociation upon these dictated alterations of a treaty, for which revival, if our ministers had consented to it, they ought to have been hanged. It was not I who advised the base people of New York to meet in a mob for the purpose of encouraging an English boat's crew to desert from their officer, thereby exciting a mutiny in the ship, which might have ended in the loss of her and in the massacre of the officers, and which, owing to the prudence and courage of those officers, did end in the ignominious death of several of the men. It was not I who stimulated the officers of the American ships of war, as also the civil magistrates, of the town of Norfolk, to inveigle away, and to screen from the power of their commanders, the seamen of an English ship of war, which was then lying in a state of distress. It was not I who encouraged the printers of newspapers, in America, to publish, just under the eye of the general government, expressions of joy that the desertion from the English ships was going on at a rate that threatened the speedy annihilation of England's naval power. It was not I, but some fiend, who pushed on those same printers to publish a proposal for raising, by public subscription, a fund out of which to give rewards to such English seamen as should desert, and arrive in America. It was not I who instilled into the empty skulls of the Americans at Rochefort to join the French, in toasting "the liberty of the seas;" nor am I to blame that the same was done by the Americans at Petersburgh, who so cordially united with the vassals of the Czar, the moment the latter became the enemy of England, and who, upon the same ground, would unite with the devil and his angels. I

had nothing to do in promoting any of those numerous acts of injustice and of insolence, which America has, for the last fifteen years, been committing against England. These are the causes of ill-blood; these are the causes of the present state of things between the two countries; these may, possibly, lead to war; but, they are none of them my work. I have, indeed, pointed them out to my readers; I have made them known to many persons who never would have heard of them except in a cursory way; and I have, I hope, contributed my full share towards exciting, in the minds of the people of England, that just indignation, which now appears to pervade all ranks of men, at the conduct of both the government and people of America. But, for the friends of America to blame me for this, is as absurd as it would be for the friends of a thief to blame the lawyers and judges for his being hanged. In exposing the culprit to the just vengeance of the nation, I have done no more than my duty; and, if duty happens to coincide with inclination, I cannot think that that circumstance requires any apology; for, if to have sustained an injury one's self is to disqualify one from speaking one's sentiments, as to the conduct of the offender, in other cases, he who has a mind to rob with impunity has only to injure every man capable of detecting and exposing him. ——But, I have, I am told, gone beyond my subject. I have taken occasion to speak of the internal government, and of the morals of the people. True; but, then, let it be borne in mind, that this became necessary, when I saw the defenders of America, with their usual effrontery, holding forth the United States as the only free and virtuous country in the world. *Character* does much, especially in England. It, therefore, became me to show, that the government of America is, in fact, one of the very worst in this world; that there is no such thing as real liberty in the country; that corruption prevails to an extent heretofore unheard of; and that the people (with the exceptions which I have before made) are the most profligately dishonest that I have ever seen, or heard described. These statements of mine might be attributed to revenge. Well, let the *making* of them be so; but, when I say, that *a judge* was detected, in Philadelphia, stealing bank notes out of a till in a shop; was afterwards driven from the bench by the shopkeeper's holding up and shaking his fist at him; and that no public proceeding, and no public expressions of indignation, were the consequence: when, I say, that it was proved that the American *Secretary of State* asked the French minister for a bribe, and that no impeachment or judicial proceeding was the consequence: when I say, that the separations of man and wife, and that elopements accompanied with robbery, are so frequent, that the printers of news-papers keep, for the purpose of placing at the head of advertisements, relating to eloped wives, figures of women in the act of running off with a bundle: when I make these assertions, I put it in the power of the friends of America to contradict me; I put it in their power to clear up these heavy charges against the morality of that country. I say that the Americans, as a nation, are the most unprincipled people in the whole world; their friends deny it; but their friends never choose to deny my specific facts; and, if these facts cannot be denied, my general assertion will be believed. Upon this subject, I want no credit for impartiality and candour. The Americans, under pretences the most false, by means the most base that ever were employed, by the vilest mockery of judicial proceedings, by openly-avowed and boasted-of perjury, robbed me of the earnings of my life up to that time, left me to begin anew with a family dependant solely upon my exertions, and have since cruelly persecuted several of my friends. For the sake of these friends more than for my own sake I hate the unprincipled nation. This hatred will never cease, until they do me justice, and, therefore, it will end but with my life. But, as to the matters in dispute between the two countries, how are they at all connected with my private feelings? Were I a minister, indeed, the case might be different. Private individual as I am, and having no access to any man in power, except through the means of the press, I can have had no hand in producing those events, upon which I have thought proper to comment.——In a second letter (received yesterday), the same correspondent tells me, that war with America may be "sport to me, but that it will be death to many others." It will not be sport to me; for I cannot but deeply lament all the hardships which my friends in Pennsylvania will suffer, and as to the perjured wretches, by whom I was robbed, I have the satisfaction to know, that many of them are already bankrupts, and, in other respects, miserable. But, to whomsoever a war will produce death, the fault rests with America: solely with her: she is the aggressor: it is for her to say whether there shall be war or peace. She has passed a non-importation act to compel us to surrender our right of searching for our own seamen. She has

passed an act for the openly-avowed purpose of forcing us to do that which would, in a short time, sap the foundation of our naval power. This act she keeps in force; and yet her interested partizans cry out that *we* are urging on a war with her. I care, comparitively, very little about the Orders in Council, as far as they relate to America. It is notorious that those Orders were not, and *could not be*, the cause of the dispute, and the probable cause of war; and yet the partizans of America keep clamouring against that measure, as the sole cause of the war that they expect and dread.——As in the case of France, so in that of America, to keep clamouring against war, is, in effect, to call upon England to submit to the demands of those powers. I have several times put to them this question, regarding the dispute with America. "Do "you advise the ministers to give up to Mr. "Jefferson the right of search for seamen?" Never can I obtain an answer. They talk vaguely about a conciliating disposition and language. They talk about the amount of exports and imports; but never do they give me an answer. The exports and imports are, in my opinion, and for the reasons I have given, of very little consequence to the strength and greatness and happiness of England; but, suppose one half of her comforts to depend upon them; nay, suppose the whole of her comforts to be so dependent, the case remains the same; for what our enemies, neutral as well as belligenent, demand of us is, a surrender of the sole means of maintaining our independence, If it be true, as is now reported, that the Americans are disposed to cease their unjust demands and their hostile conduct, why, then, peace with them by all means, and I have, for my part, no objection to the granting of them *commercial* advantages, nor even to a relaxation, with respect to them, in the execution of the Orders in Council; but, so long as they persevere in showing, by open acts, their unnatural and base partiality towards France, so long as they continue to make insolent demands upon us, so long am I for treating them with rigour. ——If we are to have peace with America, however, we shall, I repeat, have the present ministers to thank for it. Had the *concedersrs* remained in power, we *must* have had war; for, the Americans, when they had gotten from us the right of search for seamen, would have put forward some new demand; and, the insolence of all their vile captains (by far the worst of all mankind, as far as my observation or hearing has gone), and all their other agents and emissaries and partizans, in every quarter and corner of the world, would have been such as the officers of the English navy never could have borne. In a short time, there must have been war. The firmness of the ministers, in this respect, is highly praiseworthy. The letter of Mr. Canning to the American plenipotentiaries clearly shews that he well knew whom he had to deal with; and, I am persuaded, that, though it has been loudly censured by Lord Grenville, it will hereafter be regarded as a model for those English ministers who shall have to deal with the American States.——Here, I hope, we may say, that we have done with the Orders in Council, that fertile source of parliamentary motions and debates. But, I have a word or two to add upon the second letter of my correspondent, which was not received until after the former part of this article was written. In my last, I had called upon him for his *name*, seeing that he had charged me with having declared, that I would, when an opportunity offered, blow up the flame of discord between the two countries. His answer to that call is this: "You demand my name, but I "am disposed to withhold it for the follow- "ing reasons. I have stated nothing *as* "*fact*, but what rests on so firm a basis of "notorious truth, that it cannot be contra- "dicted, nor does it require the sanction of "a name. What you are pleased to call a "*"base imputation,"* I have given as a "*current report* only, and have qualified "my remarks on it with an "if this be "true." I have not even said this *of* you, "but *to* you, giving you the alternative of "suppression, if you chose it, or of con- "tradiction, if in your power, as I would "willingly hope it is. As a man of up- "rightness, therefore, I do not think I "have taken a step which requires me to go "forth from that privacy, which my ha- "bits and disposition desire, nor am I wil- "ling to put it in your power to hold me "up by name to all that observation and "perhaps ridicule, which your talents "know so well how to cast, whether justly "or unjustly, upon your opponents." Verily a most lame and paltry excuse! A *current report!* why, calling it a current report constitutes your offence. If you were to tell your neighbour, that it is currently reported that he is a thief, you would find that the subterfuge would not save your ears or your purse, according to the mode of prosecution which he might choose to adopt. As to the *alternative* which you left me, is it not evident, that you intended the *whole* of your letter for publication? Is it not

evident, that you had, as one of your principal objects, the intention of causing it to be believed, that I had *misrepresented* the case of America, merely from motives of private revenge, and that I was doing no more than acting this selfish part in pursuance of a pre-conceived and settled design? Besides, supposing me to have been at liberty, which I was not, to suppress this part of your letter, and to publish the other parts of it, I could not suppress the knowledge of it in my own mind. If I believed *you*, I must believe one of the five gentlemen (for there were no more) who were my fellow passengers to England, to be a scoundrel; and, was it acting the part of "a man of uprightness" to expose them all to the effects of my suspicions? If, in naming five men, I assert that one of them, without naming him, is a scoundrel, they have all the same ground of complaint against me. You, in effect, name all my fellow-passengers to me, and then you assert, that one of them, whom you decline to name, has said that, which, if he did say it, I know to be false; you, therefore, are guilty of the grossest injustice towards four, at least, of my fellow-passengers, and also towards myself. The truth I believe to be, that you never heard such a report as proceeding from the source, to which you pretend to trace it. That the story has obtained currency I have no doubt, nor am I at all surprized that it should. It is so natural for those who cannot answer one, who cannot deny the accusations we prefer against them, to impute to us motives of spite, like the highwayman in Joe Miller, who threatened to swear the peace against the judge, seeing that he had obviously a design upon his life.——This question respecting America, Sir, I now regard as settled. I look upon it as certain, that almost the whole of the people of England have now correct notions respecting the government, the people, the means pecuniary and military, of the American States; that they are decidedly of opinion, that war with that country is preferable to any further concession, of whatever nature and however small in amount; and, to the producing of this state of the public mind, I have the satisfaction to believe, that I have contributed as much as any private individual ever did contribute towards the producing of any national effect; a satisfaction, which I am free and forward to say, is not at all diminished, but, on the contrary, greatly augmented, by the reflection, that I have at the same time contributed towards humbling the pride of those, who used their power to treat me with the foulest injustice, and who had the baseness, even in what they call their courts of justice, to express their satisfaction at the prospect at seeing me "blighted with misery, and "my children begging their bread." When I left them, I certainly did shake the dust off my shoes; but, the only curse I pronounced upon them was this: "May you have Jef-"ferson for a President and Rush for a "Doctor!"

Lord Wellesley.——The resolutions, which were moved, in the House of Commons, by Lord Folkestone, and the discussion upon which terminated on the 15th instant, produced, at last, a vote apologizing for his lordship's conduct; but, then, that vote was proposed by *Sir John Anstruther*.——The charges, preferred against Lord Wellesley by Mr. Paull, every one has read. The proposed resolutions contained the substance of the Oude Charge. They were all, except the last, put aside, by one of those twin-brothers, *Order-of-the-day* and *Previous-question*, which seem to stick by every succeeding ministry with as much staunchness as Alderman Shaw or Billy Baldwin. The last resolution, which alone would have been sufficient for all the purposes, which the mover could have had in view, was *negatived*; and when that had been done, Sir John Anstruther moved, "That it appears to this house, that mar-"quis Wellesley, in carrying into execu-"tion the late arrangements in Oude, was "actuated by an ardent zeal for the public "service, and by the desire of providing "more effectually for the prosperity, the "defence, and the safety of the British "territories in India."——So, Sir John calls the taking of a king's dominions away from him an "*arrangement*," does he? The word *arrangement* has this meaning in the Oriental Dictionary!——Let no one suppose this to be a triumph to the Wellesleys, however. The motion was carried, of course, by a great majority; but, here is not a word of *approbation*; there is not even a word of *defence*. There is only an *apology*, and just such an one as Pitt made for his "*ardent*-minded" friend, the Lord Advocate of Scotland. The ministers would go no further; and, the reader may be assured, that they were much better pleased with Lord Folkestone's resolutions than the opposition were. No, no: they like the Marquis very well *where he is*; but, they do not, I guess, want any of his "ardent zeal" in their cabinet. Another question is coming on respecting the Nabob of Oude; and this the ministers will also like. They will like two or three, at least, of such questions,

every winter and spring. They are sure of the Marquis's attachment; for he is, especially in politics, a very constant man; and, though things are a little changed with him since the time when he used to make his tours in India, and sail in barges like that of Cleopatra, he must have, in his past deeds, a vast fund of pleasing reflection, and stand in no need of present employments. Mr. GEORGE JOHNSTONE, whom the Morning Chronicle, last year, reported to be dead, is, I perceive still alive; and, he appears to have spoken against the Marquis, though he has an office of some sort (during pleasure too) under the ministers. From this it is very easy to form a judgment as to what the wishes of the ministry were. The truth is, that the ministets wish to have the support of the marquis and his eleven friends in the parliament; but, in the offices of state, they can dispense with such support. They will say, that he *meant* well; that he *thought* he was doing his best; but there they will stop, and, I greatly commend their prudence. You hear people say, "they must take in Lords Welles-"ley and Melville, or they cannot go on." But these people do not seem to consider that they have *got* Lords Wellesley and Melville by the firmest of all possible holds: I mean, of course, the faithful attachment to principle of those noble lords. They have them safe. I'll engage that nothing will seduce them from the ministry; that is to say, as long as the latter are found to merit the keeping of their places, and the support of so decided a majority in the two Houses of Parliament.—As to the administration of Lord Wellesley, in India, we have long been *feeling* its effects; but, we shall soon see a little more of them than we have hitherto seen. A committee is appointed to inquire *into the East-India Company's affairs*, of which inquiry, I shall be deceived if the result be not *a heavy additional tax upon the people of England.*

Botley, 24th March, 1808.

DEFENCE OF AMERICA.

Sir,—In your register of the 27th Feb. (p. 335) you make a variety of remarks on the Orders in Council of November last, asserting as facts the very reverse of the truth, on points of much importance to your general arguments. I have waited the appearance of your succeeding register, in hope that some abler pen would contradict those rash assertions, but as that does not appear to be the case, I venture to do it, confiding in your candour, so far as to admit my letter into your next number.—I will first premise (to save you all the trouble of your usual ingenious conjectures,) that I am interested in a mercantile house, trading with the United States; you shall therefore, if you please consider me, as counsel for the said States, but at the same time grant me the indulgence, that is always conceded to counsel, that of convincing by evidence, and by fair arguments drawn from that evidence.—In the paper alluded to, you say, "The neutrals do submit" (to the capture by France of their ships bound to England) "for neither of "them make any public remonstrance, or "protest against the Decrees of France." You say this, in the face of the notorious fact, of the immediate explanation of the French decree, given by the Minister of Marine Decrès, to the American envoy at Paris; of the equally notorious fact, that down to the date of our Orders in Council, no vessel has been condemned, either in France or Spain for trading with England, and that only two instances had then occurred, even of capture, one by a French, and another by a Spanish privateer, both of which were restored, though loaded with English goods and English passengers. To this last case, I can speak from my own knowledge, and assert, in this public manner, that the American ship Shepherdess sailed from this port for New York, in the month of June last, loaded with English goods, and having on board numerous English passengers, that she was taken by a Spanish privateer, and carried into Bilboa, that the American resident at Madrid immediately interfered in her favour, that she was restored, (the privateer being condemned in costs,) and is since safely arrived at New York, the letter from her owners announcing that fact, now lying before me.——I am well aware of the subterfuge resorted to by those, who defend the Orders in Council,—that Decrès' assurances to Mr. Armstrong were only his opinion, but that the plain meaning of the French decree, issued at Berlin is, that all ships trading with England shall be made prize of. This is really pretending "to know better than the Doctor," for one would naturally suppose, that the opinion of a French minister, on a French decree (and still more the uninterrupted course of acting thereupon,) was of more authority than that of an English lawyer. As the case truly stood, the French blockade had just as much effect on England, as the former title of King of France, maintained by our monarch, had on the people of that country; and I cannot help thinking, that as they bore this galling yoke, of a useless title, on our part, for a good many years,

we after having suffered their empty blockade, for a few months only, might have endured it a little longer, with those feelings of contempt, which it was alone calculated to inspire —I now come to the gross mistatement you have made of a plain matter of fact. You say, (p. 357) " as matters stood " previous to the Orders in Council, a ship " load of tobacco came from America to " England with all the additional price, which " arose from the high insurance, occasioned " by the danger of capture in consequence " of the French decrees; while another " ship load of tobacco went to France free " from such high price, because there was " no danger of capture from us." So far from this assertion being true, the fact is, that it is wholly otherwise. The premiums of insurance through the year 1807 up to the news of the affair of the Chesapeake, were at peace rates, being only from 3 guineas down to 2 guineas per cent, according to the season of the year, or the goodness of the vessel. The house in which I am a partner, paid in April, 1807, from New York to London $2\frac{1}{2}$ guineas per cent. on one vessel, 2 guineas on another; in June, from New York to London $2\frac{1}{2}$ guineas, New York to Liverpool 2 guineas; in July, from New York to London 2 guineas. These quotations are from actual policies, taken at random from a bundle. During the same period, similar voyages from America to France were from 3 to 4 guineas per cent. having always been about 1 guinea per cent. higher than to England, owing to the chance of their being detained by English cruizers, in which case underwriters are pretty generally liable to pay some expenses. This statement will not, (because it cannot) be contradicted, and I call on you to give the same publicity to the truth, as you have already (unwittingly, I doubt not) given to the falsehood. And it is but fair to observe, that this rate of insurance is a criterion, better than all other speculative deductions, from which to judge of the practical import of the famous Berlin decree of Buonaparté.—I have distinctly told you I am an interested man, and I have as distinctly told you, that I desire only to be believed, if my facts or my arguments deserve it. But, you, Sir, are also an interested person. You conceive yourself to have been personally ill treated in the United States, and it is currently reported, that you said to a fellow-passenger with you to England, that you hated the United States, and, that if ever an opportunity occurred to blow up the flame of discord between the two countries, you would make the most of it. If this be true, Sir, you are not a very uninterested party yourself, and therefore, whatever you say against the Americans should be received with a greater caution, than that should be, which a trader to America may offer in their favour, in the same degree as revenge is generally esteemed to blind men's intellects more than their interest.——I rely on your inserting this letter in your next Register, and am, Sir, &c.——An American Merchant.—*New Broad Street, March 7, 1808.*

IMPORTATION OF PROVISIONS.

Sir,——The great and feeling interest which every individual has in whatever relates to the plenty, and consequent cheapness of food, will form a sufficient apology for my addressing you upon the subject of your remarks upon Mr. Young's letter, which you have published in your Register for the 20th of last month.——If you are correct in the conclusions you have drawn, and this country is independent of foreign supply for the subsistence of the people, persons of every party will have reason to rejoice; but if you are in error, if our existence depends upon an import of provisions, then should a painful anxiety be felt, and men of every party unite in endeavouring to discover the cause of this fearful state of things, and to devise means to avert the approach and weight of that distress, which may compel the country to listen to terms of peace, compromising the interest, tarnishing the honor, and even perhaps endangering the safety of the nation.—Should present abundance lead us to disregard the lessons of the past, it will be too late to apply a remedy when the pressure of dearth comes to be felt. The tremendous power, and unchecked tyranny of the enemy upon the continent, have closed all the corn ports of Europe against us; and should we even remain at peace with America, that country is unable to supply the deficiency of a scanty crop. Thus precluded from all hope of effectual foreign assistance at the moment of distress, it becomes necessary to plan beforehand the means of so increasing our supply, as shall render the nation secure from the effect of an unfavorable season.—You confidently state, that we export more human food than we import; that our import of corn does not equal our export of other kinds of provision. I wish this were the fact. I read your statement with an earnest desire to find it correct, but I fear, that when you come to reconsider it, and to couple it with some observations I am about to make, you will be under the painful necessity of drawing a different conclusion. You calculate that the population of Great Britain (11 mil-

lions of people) are supported at an average cost of 4s. a head a week, or a weekly expence of about 2 millions, which exceeding the money amount of our imports, you conclude, we rely upon foreign assistance for only one fifty-second of our consumption. Ingenious and plausible as is this statement, the error of it is quickly discoverable by those who are acquainted with the habits and food of the different parts of this island. —Excepting in years of extreme scarcity, the population of Scotland and the northern counties are supported without foreign assistance upon barley and oaten bread, and that portion of the population which is supported upon wheat, and amongst whom the foreign importation is divided, cannot in any case exceed 8 millions, but is seldom more than 7. Take it however at 8 millions, and instead of any theoretical calculation of 4s. a week a head, let me put my statement into the quantity of wheat actually consumed and imported. It is universally allowed, that on an average one individual with another who eats wheaten bread, consumes a quarter of wheat a year. With the amount of the importation of barley, peas, beans, and rye, I shall not trouble you, as it is inconsiderable, though a great quantity of oats have been usually imported. The importation of corn, on an average of the last 5 years, ending with January 1807, is 1,133,757 quarters a year, upon your own premises of 11 millions consuming wheat. This is less than a tenth of the support of the people, or the consumption of full five weeks and a half; and upon mine of only 8 millions, amongst whom the foreign supply is divided, it is more than a seventh, or the consumption of full seven weeks and a half. Thus, instead of relying upon foreign importations for one week's consumption, we depend, upon your own premises, for above five weeks, and upon mine for more than seven weeks and a half. I can anticipate your objection to this calculation, namely, that this import is not all in wheat. Granted. But then recollect, that I have not included the import of rye, meal, Indian corn, oatmeal, rice, Dutch cheese, hams, bacon, and a very long et cetera. Now rice alone in some years has been imported to the extent of above four hundred thousand hundred weight. Still you may perhaps think I over-rate the amount, or rather proportion of imports; but should you think so, permit me to remind you of the years 1800 and 1801. The averaging of 5 years is very good, and appears fair upon paper, but it is not always warranted by practice; and I feel confident, that you no more than myself, argue for the vanity of victory, but that we equally seek to discover truths, important to the best interests of our country. Now, Sir, we are considering the means of procuring the supply of a commodity (human subsistence) which, from various causes, is of annual produce, and of a perishable nature.—The produce of a plentiful year is little more than our annual consumption, and will not allow of being hoarded for any great length of time. Hence, though we have plenty this year, we are not secure from dearth the next. This was painfully felt in the years 1800 and 1801. In 1800 we imported 1,384,345 quarters of wheat *only*. In 1801 we imported 1,464,518 quarters of wheat *only*. This, upon your datum, is a consumption of 7 weeks, and upon mine of full 2 months, without reckoning the additional import of rice and other grains, which was a further subsistence of at least a fortnight!! or nearly one fifth of our consumption!!! This is no theory, it is plain matter of fact, and the only consolatory answer which can be given to it, is that which you have offered, namely, that we export in other articles an equal or greater quantity of human food. Yet, to support your answer, you instance only one kind of food exported, and that to only one place—cheese to America. Who ever heard of a ship load of cheese cleared out for America? Yet it is common for ships to enter inwards from Holland wholly laden with cheese, butter, and hams.——It is true, we export some provisions to Guernsey, Jersey, Gibraltar, our American colonies, the West Indies, our African settlements, and the East Indies, as well as to Botany Bay; and while we retain these possessions, and pursue our present colonial system, we shall continue under the necessity of making this export. Indeed, as things are at present, the demand for provisions which causes and is supplied by this export, ought to be considered as part of the demand and consumption of the empire, as a consumption we cannot diminish, as a drain and export we cannot lessen, and therefore as a lien upon our provision stock, which must be reckoned in every calculation upon the subject, instead of a surplus capable of being retained at home, and applied to meet the deficiency of a bad harvest. Had the sum of this export of provisions been to a foreign country, your argument would have been good to the extent of such export; but excepting the article of cheese and perhaps some small amount of Irish butter, I am not aware of any export of provision to foreign parts, of which we could avail our-

selves in a season of scarcity and want.—— In addition to this general statement and reasoning, permit me to call your attention to the history of our corn trade and laws for the last century.

From 1708 to 1773, the average export of wheat was - - 222,121 qrs. yearly

From 1710 to 1760, the average export of all sorts of grain was 600,000 qrs. yearly

From 1700 to 1756, only two years occurred in which wheat was imported.

From 1746 to 1765, both inclusive, the quantity exported exceeded the quantity imported by 6,649,609 qrs., or at the rate of - - - 332,480 qrs. yearly

But from 1773 to 1798, we have on an average imported - 346,374 qrs. yearly

From 1795 to 1800, we have on an average imported - 617,369 qrs. yearly

From 1800 to 1806, we have on an average imported the enormous quantity of 1,447,500 qrs. yearly

And our export during these latter periods, or from 1777 to 1804, have been only 5,400 qrs. yearly, and that small quantity has been chiefly to our own colonies.——By the foregoing table it appears, that from having a large annual export of grain enriching the country, and affording security against every contingency of seasons, we have gradually become an importing nation, depending for a large portion of our subsistence upon foreign supply. For the last 40 years we have been exchanging our gold and our silver for subsistence, and now a new order of things has arisen. It is now no longer a question of commercial policy; no longer a matter of profit and loss, whether the past system is to be pursued. However willing we may be to enrich other countries, to vivify the agriculture, and stimulate the industry of other nations, we shall not be permitted to purchase the agricultural produce of the continent. All the corn ports of Europe are closed, and all the wealth of these islands will be unable to purchase a supply of food from the continent. To such observations as I have been addressing you, I have not unfrequently heard it remarked, "wheat is only about "70s. a quarter." So much the worse on every account: the price is too low to stimulate an increasing and productive tillage; this low price deceives us into a dangerous security. Even suppose it to arise wholly from a bountiful season, and in nothing to result from the present corn laws, still by next August or September it will be all consumed, and then a month's hard rain, or should mildew blight our crops in one week, what will be our prospect? how general will be the distress and pressure of scarcity? to what country can we look for aid? Upon import from America we cannot depend, even if we continue at peace with the United States. Thus, then, it appears to me, that a due consideration of the subject brings the painful conviction, that we rely upon foreign import to an alarming and dangerous extent; that from an export of six hundred thousand quarters of corn annually, we have gradually come to require an import of nearly a million and a half of quarters; that in years of scarcity we depend upon foreign supply for nearly a fifth of our consumption, and that in ordinary seasons we depend upon importation for a seventh part of our subsistence.—Should these remarks be deemed to merit your attention, and the dangers which I fear await us, appear of sufficient moment to call for serious consideration and the application of an immediate and efficacious remedy, I will in another letter proceed to investigate the causes of this fearful state of things, and discuss the merits of the principal remedies which have been proposed, and endeavour to suggest some further ones to the public notice.——I am, your's, &c.—— EDWARD WAKEFIELD ——*Duke-street, Westminster, 14th March,* 1808.

SINKING FUND.

SIR;——Your correspondent C. S. (p. 938, vol. 12,) could not find any meaning in those "plausible" doubts, on which I ventured to ask for instruction, and which appeared in your Register of 14th Nov. p. 766; but to assist my ignorance, he begins by charging me with sinister designs, because "I have dragged out *his* conclusions "before your readers, and left behind the "curtain those of Mr. Pitt and Lord H. "Petty," as if such words might not have been omitted for sake of brevity, and of the adage, nullius in verba. C. S. had reduced their poetic calculations into a prose brief,—he adopted the proof not without contempt of their authors; and now he flies to his deified name for shelter from the rule of three. His quotations of Lord H. Petty's quotation of Mr. Pitt's second-sight was needless, for every stock-holder had by rote how that angel confessed what he *foresaw*; (timely and well-acted confession) that a nation, out of debt, must be in the high road to bankruptcy. C. S. goes on to dissipate my doubts thus: (p. 940) "Un- "questionably they are ignorant of the ef- "fects of competition and capital, who can "doubt the extent of the mischiefs that "must result from the *competition* of 600 "millions with a capital of 100 millions."

It is not to the purpose. I expressed no doubt of any such thing. What I said was, that if the 600 millions be discharged, *by means of the Sinking Fund*, that such competition cannot exist, on any addition to the circulating capital; therefore, your correspondent's colloquy between Jacobin and Solomon, setting the Thames on fire, and his nine times quoted phrase of Pitt's, are all alike irrelevant. He says, (p. 941) "now "that the extensive calamities of a SUDDEN "extinction" (impossible) "of the debt "is admitted on all hands!!" How, a certain consequence to follow impossible premises! No,—but if it be extinguished by means of the Sinking Fund, which must take up before it pays down, I doubted if that competition is possible. The trustees to the Sinking Fund have taken up suppose 140 millions of the 600 of debt. I ask did the money which they paid away for those 140 * millions, encrease the circulating capital or not? If it did, his premises are false, and if not his conclusions are false. C. S. asserts, that, "anominal "encrease has the same effect on real mo- "ney as a real encrease could have, and "all he contends for is that it must no- "minally encrease to the amount of the "debt, and therefore that the real de- "preciation must be in the proportion "which the debt bears to the circulation." This is irrelevant, unless it contemplates payment of the debt without the aid of taxes, and that the debentures in circulation are no part (real or nominal) of the circulating capital. It has no effect on the doubts which I have suggested in a single sentence, that payment of the 600 millions of debt by means of the Sinking Fund, which is in fact *by means of taxes taken out of the Circulating Capital*, cannot produce any increase whatever. C. S. continues (page 943) "we "contend for the nominal increase on the "well ascertained ground that if we expend "the *identical* £10. in the market 10 times "over in one day, we have nominally sent "£100 in that day, and therefore depre- "ciated the value of money as much as if "we had actually sent £100 at one time." I know not how such axiom is applicable, or "well-ascertained," and confess I have my doubts of its truth.—His third sub-division asserts that my "notion" is old, although in his first page he says that "if it be truly "just, it is really new,"—but be it old or new, I intreat Mr. Cobbett himself to inform a society of Irish who love him because he loves his own country in earnest, whether the Sinking Fund can by any contrivance take up a single debenture out of the market until it takes the value of that debenture *out of circulation*, or if 140 millions of debt already paid off, were gathered out of a pocket where that sum was *not*. As to C. S. notable remedies for the ruin now in full march, *viz.* "to take peace any how—to "surrender the naval dominion—to go "back to where our forefathers left us— "to teach our population the use of arms, "and agriculture to our soldiers, &c. &c." (p. 947) I only say, that it is a pity he omitted the plan of that law giver called Gonsalez in the Tempest,—"I would by "contraries execute all things—no traffic "would I admit,—no magistrate,—LETTERS "should not be known,—poverty, riches, "none,—bounds of land, vineyard, olive, "none,—no use of metal, wine or oil,— "no occupation,—all men idle,—all,—and "woman too, but innocent and pure.— "treason, knife, gun, or use of any "engine, would I not have,—but nature "should bring forth all abundance to feed "my innocent people."—C. S. concludes, "show *us* that no real or nominal increase "will take place if the national debt be "paid, and then we shall confess our error, "but till then we maintain, &c. &c." It is not reasonable for a professor of prophecy to throw the burden of proof upon his ignorant audience. It calls to mind honest Swift's Tale of a Tub, and Lord Peter's argument, to prove that the bread which he gave his brothers for dinner, was not bread, but mutton.—I am, Sir, &c.—OSGUR.

* I have no means of ascertaining this sum—and wish Mr. Cobbett may correct it, as a just view of it, is of great importance.

IRELAND.

"Thus should all our efforts be directed "to render the Irish willing, by making "them comfortable subjects; then shall "we most effectually have succeeded in "opening their eyes to the evils they have "invariably suffered, by yielding to seduc- "tion; then shall we have made the people "loyal, from the only principle that can "make loyalty sincere, vigorous, or ration- "al; a conviction that it is their true inte- "rest. The landed gentlemen of Ireland "can alone impart this conviction, for "through them only can the lower orders "estimate the value of the government un- "der which they live; from them must "originate those comforts on which that "conviction depends; they alone can de- "stroy the facility of seduction; they alone "can remove the disorder, for with them "lies the disease and the remedy, and that

" remedy consists in a fair and just com-
" mutation of tythes, in the grant of a pub-
" lic maintenance for the Catholic and Pres-
" byterian clergy, in a diminution of absen-
" tees, and an increased attention on the
" part of resident landlords, to the welfare
" and happiness of their tenantry. What
" the clergy can do to effect such desirable
" objects they will do, provided the gentle-
" men of landed property shew no disposi-
" tion to relieve one class at the expence of
" another; with the landlords therefore, it
" lies to avert the evil day from Ireland,
" and from the empire: they alone are
" competent to save both. Need I urge
" them more—'tis time that they awake
" from a lethargic inactivity; 'tis time that
" they look the state of Ireland fairly in the
" face, and for their own sake at least, en-
" deavour to alter a line of conduct, which
" has stamped that face with features so ex-
" pressive of ill usage and mismanage-
" ment."

Sir,——I have taken the above extract from an excellent Pamphlet, recently published in Dublin, entitled " An Enquiry into " the History of Tythes, with a plan for " modifying that system, and providing an " adequate maintenance for the Catholic " and Presbyterian Clergy," which I seriously recommend to the perusal of all members of parliament, or other hereditary or accidental counsellors of state, and integral parts of the government, as a work replete with valuable information, clear reasoning and dispassionate statement; and, therefore, of particular use, when, as in all probability there will be, a talk in parliament about Ireland and tythes, it is indispensibly necessary for the members to get a luncheon of information on these subjects, (for the pamphlet is too short to constitute a full meal); to the spread of instruction upon these interesting points, it would be injustice not to confess that your valuable Register has greatly contributed. If I do not mistake, you were the very first who detected the trick of the Protestant country gentlemen (whom you most properly designated as the keenest set in the world) and exposed it as it deserved to be exposed. Trust me, Mr. Cobbett, till that race of Centaurs is regenerated—till their bestial is converted into rational, neither Catholic emancipation, nor commutation of tythes will ever work the great work of peace. Till land is let at such rates as will enable the tiller to feed, clothe, and educate his family, the Irish peasantry must remain ignorant, naked, and wretched. It is well observed by a very ingenious correspondent of yours, " that there are mis-
" chiefs in Ireland, which no legislative in-
" terference can reach." He is right, and the rapacity of squires of all sects, and their systematic grinding of the poor, is one of these mischiefs. Our whole Irish representation consisting of one hundred wise and well informed gentlemen, who, as Fontenelle said of the French academicians, " ont l'esprit comme quatre," joined to the equally wise and well informed representation of England, Scotland, and Wales, could not, I will venture to say, in their united wisdom, devise any law competent to remove this evil. It is intertwisted with the very fibres of a squire's nature; he imbibes it from his mother, and his father inculcates it along with the alphabet and the multiplication table.—This is the party in Ireland that is most formidable to the real prosperity of the country; this is the sour balm that leavens the lower classes into turbulence; these are the people that Mr. Grattan should have pointed his rhetorical rockets against: he humm'd and he ha'd, and he see-sawed himself into a very pretty sort of an oratorical rage against a French party; but he should have been coolly indignant against the squires, and proved plainly and simply that they are the fountain head, from whence the real waters of bitterness flow, and that if they were but commonly just to the most grateful, noble hearted people in the world the Irish, the French party might either dwindle into dancing masters and dentists, or go to America and debate with closed doors (and windows too) upon the propriety of going without great coats and breeches, by way of distressing the Yorkshire clothiers. What wretched shuffling and twisting and temporizing is this! Will members of parliament for ever come forward and stigmatize the Irish as idle, rebellious and ungrateful, and yet conceal the real causes of these curses; the wretchedness entailed upon the Irish by the landed proprietors. One honourable gentleman makes a very neat speech, and attributes all the disturbances to the tythes; these are the Grattanites. Another tells the house that the Pope, poor man, is at the bottom of the riots. These are the Redesdalites; but, I have yet heard no antisquirulist get up in his place, and declare boldly and honestly that the distractions of Ireland arise from the exorbitant price of land, the thumbscrewing of rack rents, and its ruinous, impolitic, and inhuman expedient of refusing leases, disallowing the tenants right, and enhancing the rate of farms by the horrid expedient of canting. By such infamous conduct on the part of the landed proprietors, the whole population of the country are alie-

nated. All the bonds that bind man to man, and men to their native land are snapped in twain; the permeating principles of local attachment, that like the roots of the pine, make their way through the hardness of the barren mountain, and bind the tree even to the naked rock, are rudely extirpated. Home, that dear delightful refuge of the human heart, is denied to the poor Irishman,—he may be turned from one moment to another from the hut he has reared, and the garden he has planted. And, yet this creature whom the Almighty endowed with every noble propensity, and generous feeling, shall be stigmatized as innately savage, intemperate, and intractable, because he turns upon the curs that are hunting him to desperation, and refuses to lick the hand that is raised to scourge and to torment him. This, Mr. Cobbett, is the truth—and till the truth be told in and out of parliament, things will proceed as they have done, most disastrously. I really congratulate the country that there is one channel yet left for the dissemination of truth—the Political Register is that channel. I will not pretend to assert that you are always right, but this I will affirm from a long acquaintance with the Political Register, that it contains more truth in the publications of one month, than the whole tribe of newspapers in one year; and I am rejoiced that you give a column now and then to the affairs of Ireland; they are indeed in a perilous state; but as the author from whose pamphlet I have quoted, well observes, "with the landlords it lies to avert "the evil day from Ireland, and from the "empire; they alone are competent to save "both." I may trouble you hereafter with some further observations upon this subject, and throw out some hints upon the education of squires, which might if adopted by their sires and dams, prove eminently useful to the future breed. Ireland is of vital consequence to Great Britain, and recent events have only confirmed the observation of Sir Richard Cox, in the dedication of his history to William and Mary, after stating that Ireland had cost their predecessors an unspeakable mass of blood and treasure,—"but no cost can be "too great where the prize is of such va-"lue, and whoever considers the situation, "ports, plenty, and other advantages of "Ireland, will confess that it must be re-"tained at what rate soever, because, if it "would come into the enemies hands, Eng-"land would find it impossible to flourish, "and perhaps to subsist without it."—I remain, &c.—MALB.—*Dublin.*

TITHES.

SIR;——Among the many letters which have appeared in your Register on various subjects, one in your last, signed J. P. D. has, I confess, excited not a little surprise in my mind.—My object in addressing you (and I confess I do it with diffidence, being the first time I have ventured to write, Mr. Cobbett) is to notice the fallacy of J. P. D.'s statement with respect to tithes and their influence on religion; and to ask whether you seriously think the churches are deserted, and the established religion suffered to decline from any such cause?—Is it possible, Sir, such a delusion can have successfully palmed itself on J. F. D.'s imagination? Or, is not it more probable that he has taken this ground, knowing how soon, above other causes, a religious outcry will have effect. It surely cannot be difficult to trace the desertion of our churches to some other cause. It arises out of the palpably notorious negligence of so many of its clergy. I know the objections that exist against such an opinion, but I also know that you and all other honest men, Mr. Cobbett, must conclude, that while the majority, or at least a large proportion of the church clergy are deficient in their duty to the people committed to their charge, the nature and unavoidable consequence is, that the people, in their turn, should fall short in the respect due only to a man worthy of the office he sustains; and it must be equally clear, that where the ministers of religion fail to stimulate by their own energy and example, the religion of those under their care will soon degenerate into nothing but the name. Such being the case, it is to this cause principally, and not to the obnoxious nature of tythes, we are to ascribe the decline of our established religion, and the desertion of our church. I would be understood to mean, by the word "established," the form of religion in use with the church of England; for the assertion that real religion is on the decline, if your correspondent means real religion by the terms used, I can by no means admit. On the contrary, I firmly believe it to be increasing. —I do not intend entering more on this part of his letter, for in that case I should expect, if you deemed my letter worthy any notice, you would declare your publication not the vehicle of religious communications, and very properly; but I could not read J. F. D's statements without a few remarks on their fallacy, as far as they refer to the point I have noticed; and though you may not admit remarks on religious topics to swell your pages generally, I have read your Register long enough to know how willing you are always to expose error yourself, as well as afford others the opportunity of doing it. I would also say a few words on another assertion in the

same letter.—J. F. D. has said, that " were the tithes abolished, Old England would from that circumstance become happy, prosperous, and thriving," that " our granaries would always be filled with corn," and that, under any circumstances, we should never need the aid of importation. And is this great and wonderful change to be effected by taking from the church its tenths of the produce of the land, and giving the value of that tenth in some other way ? I do heartily join in that gentleman's zealous hope, but I would suggest that such an event from such a cause may never take place. No, Sir, whoever may live to see this country again " prosperous and thriving," will witness much more important changes than the abolition of tythes : he will see our satesmen breathing the spirit of public virtue ; he will see no factious opposition to those statesmen, because one set are in power and the other out ; pensions and places will be done away ; and a due regard paid to the country's rights. He will see the taxes of his country lessened or more equally imposed ; the national debt diminished, and our dignity, as a great and independent nation, proudly maintained. He will see a parliament pure and independent ; its seats occupied according to the laws ; and every member bearing within himself the spirit of impartiality, deciding according to the dictates of a conscientious, upright judgment, and not, as now, either indolently or intentionally giving his yea or nay to enactments agreeably to the side he sits on in the house. —I would not now say much on the justice or injustice of the mode adopted in collecting the tithes ; I am afraid with J. F. D. that too generally it is oppressive and vexatious : but surely in the instance he has adduced his friend could have easily gained ample compensation by other means than remonstrance for so wanton an insult, so flagrant a breach of equity and justice.—The laws of this country must be defective indeed, if they permit such an outrage against society without producing adequate punishment to prevent its repetition ; and if they do provide such a remedy, there must have been some defect on the part of J. F. D.'s friend, who could refrain from bringing such an offender under its operation.—I have myself known instances where much ill will has arisen on the subject of tithes, but in many of them (I mean where the incumbent has collected them himself) it had its origin with the person from whom the tithe was due, *and not* with the person claiming it.—I confine myself, of course, to England in my remarks, for I am unacquainted utterly with this subject as it regards Ireland ; although I have always understood every thing that has appeared in the Register on this point, (far as my recollection will carry me) except the letter of J. F. D. to refer only to the sister kingdom.—I am, &c.—S. A.—*London, 15th Feb.* 1808.

OFFICIAL PAPERS.

ENGLAND AND SWEDEN.—*Convention between his Majesty and the King of Sweden —signed at Stockholm on the 8th February*, 1808.

The consequences of the treaty of Tilsit, between Russia and France, unfolding themselves more and more, in such a manner as to threaten Sweden with a speedy invasion, for the purpose of enforcing her to accede to the French system ; and his Swedish majesty finding himself therefore under the necessity of bringing forward, to resist its effects, a greater force than he has at his ordinary disposal, his Britannic majesty, animated with the constant desire of contributing to the defence and security of his ally, and of supporting him, by every means, in a war, undertaken for the mutual interests of both states, has determined to give to his Swedish majesty an immediate aid in money, as being the most prompt and efficacious, to be paid from time to time at fixed periods ; and their majesties having judged it expedient, that a formal convention with regard to their reciprocal intentions, in this respect, should be concluded, they have for this purpose named and authorised their respective plenipotentiaries ; that is to say—in the name and on the part of his majesty the king of the United kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Edward Thornton, Esq. his envoy extraordinary and Minister plenipotentiary to his majesty the King of Sweden ; and in the name and on the part of his majesty the King of Sweden, the Baron D'Ehrenheim, president of his chancery, and commander of his order of the polar star, who, after having communicated to each other their respective full powers, have agreed upon the following articles :—

Article. I. His majesty the king of the United kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland engages that there shall be paid to his Majesty the King of Sweden the sum of twelve hundred thousand pounds sterling, in equal instalments of one hundred thousand pounds sterling each, per month, beginning with the month of January of the present year inclusively, and to continue succesively in the cource of each month, the first of which instalments shall be paid on the ratification of the present convention

by his Swedish majesty.—II. His majesty the King of Sweden engages on his part to employ the said sum in putting into motion, and keeping on a respectable establishment, all his land forces, and such part as shall be necessary of his fleet, and particularly his flotilla, in order to oppose the most effectual resistance to the common enemies.—III. Their said majesties moreover engage to conclude no peace, or truce, or convention of neutrality, with the enemy, but in concert and mutual agreement.—IV. The present convention shall be ratified by the two high contracting parties, and its ratification shall be exchanged at London within the space of six weeks after the signature of the said convention, or sooner if it can be done. —*Separate Article.* The two high contracting parties have agreed to concert, as soon as possible, the measures to be taken, and the auxiliary succours to be stipulated for, in the case of a war actually taking place between Sweden and the powers her neighbours; and the stipulation which may thence result shall be considered as separate and additional articles to this convention, and shall have the same force as if they were word for word inserted therein.

PORTUGAL.—*Proclamation issued from the Office of the Secretary of State for the Affairs of Portugal. Dated Lisbon, Dec. 4, 1807.*

The rulers of this kingdom being informed, within these few days, that the prices of some articles of the first necessity had been raised to an exorbitant price, order the Senate to check every excess which may in this respect take place, with all due vigilance and severity, in order that, without the authority of government, and without the most urgent motives, the prices of provisions must not be raised; and the Senate will, by proclamation, make this known.—In prompt obedience to this injuction, the Senate hereby ordains, that no person of any class or condition whatever, shall raise the prices of all or any articles of the first necessity, beyond the rate at which such article, or any of them, were sold on the 28th of Nov. last.—And whoever shall transgress this order shall incur a penalty of 8000 reis, and be confined in prison, where he shall remain ten days for the first offence, and for the second such penalties shall be doubled, and such person to be prohibited from opening a shop, or to sell any article whatever, &c. &c.—(Signed) FRANCISCO DE MENDENZ CARRAISE MULLO.

ROME.—*Notice of the Secretary of State Cardinal Cassoni. Dated Rome Feb. 2, 1808.*

His Holiness Pius VII. being unable to conform to all the demands made on him by the French government, and to the extent required of him, as it is contrary to his sacred duties, and the dictates of his conscience; and being thus compelled to submit to the disastrous consequences which have been threatened, and to the military occupation of his capital, in case he should not submit to such demands:—Yielding, therefore, in all humility of heart, to the inscrutable determinations of the Most High, he places his cause in the hands of the Almighty; and being unwilling to fail in the essential obligations of guaranteeing the rights of his sovereignty, he has commanded us to protest, and formally protests in his own name, as well as in that of his successors, against any occupation whatever of his dominions, being desirous that the rights of the holy chair should remain, now and henceforward, uninjured and untouched. As the vicar on earth of that God of Peace who taught by his divine example humility and patience, he has no doubt, but his most beloved subjects, who have given him so many repeated proofs of obedience and attachment, will make it their peculiar study to preserve peace and tranquillity, private as well as public, which his Holiness exhorts, and expressly commands; and that, far from committing any excesses, they will rather respect the individuals of a nation, from whom, during his journey, and stay in Paris, he received so many flattering testimonies of devotion and regard.

WESTPHALIA.—*Royal Decree, by which it is ordered that the English Goods found at Marburg shall be publicly burned.*

We, Jerome Napoleon, &c. on the report of our minister of justice and affairs of the interior, have decreed, and do decree as follows:—Art. I. The English commodities, which, by orders of the prefect of the Wirra, were seized on the 1st instant, at Marburg, and which have been ascertained to be English manufacture by the merchants and assessors of the deputation of commerce appointed to make the inquiry, and by the printed notices of the commercial house of Wendeker and Co. at Wetzlar, shall be forthwith burnt in the public places at Marburg.—Art. II. Our minister of justice and the affairs of the interior is commissioned to carry into execution the present decree, which shall be inserted in the bulletin of laws.—Given in our royal palace at Cassel, the 5th of Feb., 1808, and in the 2d year of our reign.

Printed by Cox and Baylis, No. 75, Great Queen Street, and published by R. Bagshaw, Brydges Street, Covent Garden, where former Numbers may be had; sold also by J. Budd, Crown and Mitre, Pall-Mall.